**RESEARCH PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM**

**GDPE Grants for Graduate Research**

We have solicited applications for small grants (up to $2,500) to graduate students in GDPE to assist them in conducting research for their degree. Please provide scores for each of the criteria in two sections of this rubric: “Proposal” and “Applicant”.

* For the “**Proposal Criteria,**” please evaluate the quality of the applicant’s research proposal, budget and justification by assigning an appropriate value up to the maximum points allowed for that criterion (indicated in parentheses). Descriptions are provided for exceptional performance in each area. Only those proposals that excel in the outlined criteria should receive full points for that section.
* For the “**Applicant Criteria**”, please refer to the application for information to aid you in assigning a qualitative rank according to the detailed rubric for each criterion. That rank will then be converted into a point value. Our hope is for the ranking to make it easier for reviewers to differentiate between students based on their qualifications.

Please email completed rubrics to Jennifer Neuwald (jennifer.neuwald@colostate.edu). Please name each review with: “StudentLastName\_Review\_YourLastName.”

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Name of Reviewer:**

**Name of Applicant:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROPOSAL CRITERIA (80%)** | **SCORE** |
| **(1) Quality of the proposed research** *(max = 40pt)***:**   * Non-incremental contribution to field * Well-communicated questions * Interesting and reasonable hypotheses * Methods are designed to test hypotheses * Preliminary results (if relevant) and expected outcomes clearly articulated |  |
| **(2) Quality of the proposal** *(max = 20pt)***:**   * Places research in broader context * Justifies questions asked in terms of advancing knowledge * Well-written & organized * No grammatical/spelling errors |  |
| **(3) Adherence to guidelines** *(max = 10pt)***:**   * 2 pages max for proposal *(including references)* * 3 pages max for application *(including* *budget and justification)* * 11 pt font min * Includes required sections: questions, hypotheses, methods/data analyses, results to date, expected outcomes, references |  |
| **(4) Justification for funds requested** *(max = 10pt)***:**  *The budget and justification can be found in the application.*   * Funds requested correspond to research proposed * Reasonable request based on need |  |
| **SUBTOTAL based on PROPOSAL (max=80):** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **APPLICANT CRITERIA (20%)** | **RANK** | | |
| *Please evaluate each student’s application based on whether they (EE) Exceed Expectations, (ME) Meet Expectations, or (AE) Approach Expectations. Enter the appropriate point value in the appropriate column.* | **AE** | **ME** | **EE** |
| **(5) Publications & Presentations** *(AE=1pt; ME=2pt; EE=3pt)***:**   * Number & quality of presentations * Number and quality of publications * Work presented is from their current degree plan |  |  |  |
| **(6) GDPE Activities** *(AE=3pt; ME=6pt; EE=9pt)***:**  *Examples of* ***GDPE*** *participation include:*   * Representative on ExCom or GDPE DEI committee * FRSES officer, volunteer, presenter *(ranked accordingly)* * Regular GDPE seminar attendance *(including Distinguished Ecologist)* * Host DE speakers * Lead an ECOL592 seminar * GDPE representative at meetings * Student forum or workshop participant * Contributor to twitter or newsletter * Orientation or Recruitment mentor   *Evaluation example: a student who has served on ExCom, volunteered for FRSES, served as a GDPE student mentor, and attends DE seminars would rank much higher (EE-9) than a student who only attend seminars (AE-3).* |  |  |  |
| **(7) Professional Development** *(AE=1pt; ME=2pt; EE=3pt)***:**   * TILT Workshops * Diversity, Equity, Inclusivity workshops and initiatives * Active mentoring or mentorship training |  |  |  |
| **(8) Progress Toward Degree** *(AE=0pt; ME=1pt; EE=2pt)***:**   * GPA * Appropriate progress based on stage (e.g. 1st year, candidacy, etc.) |  |  |  |
| **(9) Advisor Support** *(AE=1pt; ME=2pt; EE=3pt)***:**   * Specificity and strong examples in support * Overall quality/ranking of student * Special considerations (e.g. engagement in outreach, DEI, exceptional performance) * Justification of need |  |  |  |
| **SUBTOTAL based on APPLICANT (max=20):** |  | | |
| **TOTAL POINTS (max=100):**  *(include both proposal and applicant criteria)* |  | | |

**(continue onto the next page)**

**One of the most valuable components of this proposal writing experience is to get feedback from the reviewer. Whether or not students are awarded funds for this cycle, your constructive comments can help set our students up for future success with future awards (both internal and external). Please take time to include written feedback below. Your comments will be shared with the student anonymously. Our hope is that our students will be able to take your advice to help improve their grant-writing skills as well as their research.**

**Anonymous Comments from the Reviewer *(to be shared with the student)*:**

**Comments to GDPE only *(optional and confidential)*:**

**Qualitative Ranking:**

Please provide a qualitative ranking to summarize the combination of the quality of the proposal, the quality of the student, the degree plan & stage of the student, and the need of the student. If we have two equally ranked proposals, and only could fund one, how strongly would you recommend this proposal *(circle one from below)*?

**Highly Competitive Competitive Not Competitive**